



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,224	12/05/2001	Roman Basko	342818027US	8275
25096	7590	10/26/2005	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP PATENT-SEA P.O. BOX 1247 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			THAI, HANH B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/005,224	BASKO ET AL.	
	Examiner Hanh B. Thai	Art Unit	2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 7/18/05.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-10,67-73,76,77 and 91-94 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-26,34-48,66,74,75,78,79,85 and 86 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 27-33,49-65,80-84 and 87-90 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

This is in response to amendment filed July 18, 2005.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment to claims 66-67, 79-85 and 91-94 are acknowledged.

Consequently, the rejection to claims 66-67, 79-85 and 91-94 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is withdrawn.

2. Due to the newly found references, the allowance of claims 11-26, 34-47, 66, 79, 85-86 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 11-26, 34-48, 66, 74-75, 78-79 and 85-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharma et al. (5,809,235).

Regarding claims 11, 41-44, 45-46, 47-48, 66, 74-75, 78-79 and 85-86, Sharma discloses a computer-implemented method for analyzing interaction data to identify occurrences of defined types of events, the method comprising:

- receiving an indication of interaction data that is associated with a content set and that has at least one entry, each entry related to an interaction with the content set (abstract; summary, col.4, lines 16-25);

- receiving an indication of at least one communication definition that specifies a manner of communicating content set interactions (abstract; summary, col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46);
- receiving an indication of multiple event type definitions each specifying a type of interaction with the content set and each associated with one of the communication definitions (abstract; summary, col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46); and
- for each entry of the interaction data, determining whether the entry matches one of the event type definitions in such a manner that the related interaction for the entry is of the type specified by that event type definition and was communicated in the manner specified by the communication definition associated with that event type definition; and when it is determined that the entry matches one of the event type definitions, storing an indication of an occurrence of that event type (abstract; summary, “table 1”; col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46 and col.8, lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 12, Sharma discloses the method wherein the content set is a web site with multiple web pages (Fig.5, Fig.6A-B and corresponding text).

Regarding claim 13, Sharma discloses the method wherein the content set is a group of multiple related web pages that are a subset of web pages of a web site (Fig.5, Fig.6A-B and corresponding text).

Regarding claim 14, Sharma discloses the method wherein the content set is multiple related web sites each having multiple web pages (Fig.5, Fig.6A-B and col.7, line 46 and col.8, lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 15, Sharma discloses the method wherein the content set is a group of related items (Fig.5, Fig.6A-B and col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46).

Regarding claim 16, Sharma discloses the method wherein the content set is a service providing multiple features (abstract; summary, col.4, lines 16-25).

Regarding claim 17, Sharma discloses the method wherein the content set is an executing program providing various functionalities (abstract; summary, col.4, lines 16-25).

Regarding claim 18, Sharma discloses the method wherein each of the interactions related to the interaction data entries includes specifying a Uniform Resource Indicator (Fig.5).

Regarding claim 19, Sharma discloses the method wherein each of the interactions related to the interaction data entries includes requesting that functionality be provided (col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46 and col.8, lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 20, Sharma discloses the method wherein each of the interactions related to the interaction data entries includes supplying information (abstract; summary, col.4, lines 16-25).

Regarding claim 21, Sharma discloses the method wherein the manner of communicating content set interactions specified by each of the communication definitions includes using a specified IP address and port number to communicate information related to an interaction (col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46 and col.8, lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 22, Sharma discloses the method wherein the manner of communicating content set interactions specified by each of the communication definitions includes using a specified domain name to communicate information related to an interaction (col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46 and col.8, lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 23, Sharma discloses the method wherein the manner of communicating content set interactions specified by each of the communication definitions includes using a specified group of communication parameters to communicate information related to an interaction (col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46 and col.8, lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 24, Sharma discloses the method wherein the manner of communicating content set interactions specified by each of the communication definitions includes identifying a specified portion of the content set to which an interaction is to be communicated (abstract; summary, “table 1”; col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46 and col.8, lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 25, Sharma discloses the method wherein the manner of communicating content set interactions specified by each of the communication definitions includes identifying a specified computing device or computer program provider to which an interaction is to be communicated (col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46).

Regarding claim 26, Sharma discloses the method wherein each of the interactions related to the interaction data entries includes specifying a Uniform Resource Indicator, and wherein the type of interaction specified by each of the event type definitions includes a pattern capable of matching at least one Uniform Resource Indicator (Fig.5 and corresponding text, Sharma).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (5,809,235).

Regarding claims 34-40, Sharma discloses the network event type definitions of data interactions (abstract; summary, “table 1”; col.6, line 26 to col.7, line 46 and col.8, lines 26-67). Sharma, however, does not disclose the determining of specific entry match of indication of exclusion definition of data interactions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to analyze the specific data interaction into the network data interaction of Sharma. The motivation of doing so would have been to enhance the network event management framework.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 27-33, 49-65, 80-84 and 87-90 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Claims 1-10, 67-73, 76-78 and 91-94 are allowed over the prior art of records.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding independent claims 1, 67, 68, 72, 74, 76, 78 and 91, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed method, system and computer-readable medium for analyzing interaction or usage data for customers. The interaction or usage data is stored in log files and supplemented

Art Unit: 2163

with data from other sources. Various data parsing information is defined and used as part of the analysis by using customer-specific information to identify various occurrences of interest. When analyzing a customer's web site interaction data, the parser component can use data defining customer-specific types of web site events of interest. Types of occurrences can be specified in a variety of ways by using a combination of a logical web site, one or more URIs corresponding to web pages, and/or one or more query strings.

The dependent claims, being further limiting to the independent claims, definite and enabled by the Specification are also allowed.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B. Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

October 14, 2005



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER